

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Eric W. Fleischman	7784-000656 2460		
	EXAMINER		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828		RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	2617		
]		L.C. RAMPURIA,	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N .	Applicant(s)		
		10/698,800	FLEISCHMAN, ERIC W.		
	Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Sharad Rampuria	2617		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, exply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ARANDONE.	L. sely filed the mailing date of this communication.		
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
5)☐ 6)⊠ 7)☐ 8)☐ Applicati 9)☐ 10)⊠	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing she	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. ⊠ accepted or b) □ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) D Notice 3) D Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa			

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

I. The Art Unit location of this application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

II. The current office-action is in response to the amendments/remarks filed on 06/13/2006.

Accordingly, Claims 1-22 are pending for further examination as follows:

Drawings

III. The receipt of drawings filed on 06/13/2006 is accepted by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

IV. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

V. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-10, 12-14, 16, 18-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Richton [US 6650902].

As per claim 1, Richton teaches:

A method of geo-casting a message to a plurality of recipients each having an address and a known geographic location, (Abstract, Col.2; 59-Col.3; 8) comprising:

Reporting the current locations (e.g. compare with user's current location; Col.14; 1-11, 62-67 and Col.4; 3-14) and addresses of the plurality of recipients to a geospatial database; (201; Fig.2, Col.3; 9-28)

Designating a geographic region by reference to a structure within the geographic region; (302; Fig.2, Col.3; 9-28)

Determining the addresses of the recipients that are located within the geographic region by using the geospatial database to compare the current reported locations (e.g. compare with user's current location; Col.14; 1-11, 62-67 and Col.4; 3-14) of the recipients with the reference to the structure; (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1) and

Targeting the message to the addresses of each of the recipients having current locations (e.g. compare with user's current location; Col.14; 1-11, 62-67 and Col.4; 3-14) within the geographic region. (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1)

As per claim 2, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the identifying the recipients further comprises accessing a geospatial database and comparing the locations of the recipients and the designated geographic region. (Col.4; 3-14)

As per claim 3, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising specifying a delivery method; and transmitting the message according to the specified delivery method. (Col.5; 26-43)

As per claim 4, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the recipients is mobile relative to the geographic region. (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1)

As per claim 5, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 1, wherein the identifying the recipients further comprises operating a computer at an OSI application level. (i.e. email...voicemail etc; Col.5; 21-25)

As per claim 7, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 6, wherein the transmitting the message further comprises requesting a reply, whereby recipients which do not receive the message may be identified. (Col.3; 39-62 and Col.7; 2-11)

As per claim 9, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 1, further comprising determining whether an event has occurred and, if the event has occurred, then transmitting the message being made in response to the event. (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1)

As per claim 10, Richton teaches:

The method according to claim 9, wherein the event further comprises a reported location being across a border, the message being a border crossing warning, the geographic destination designator designating within a predetermined distance from the border. (Col.3; 39-62 and Col.7; 2-11)

As per claim 12, Richton teaches:

A telecommunication system comprising:

A network; a transmitter connected to the network; (Abstract, Col.2; 59-Col.3; 8)

A memory containing a geospatial database and in communication with the transmitter; (201; Fig.2, Col.3; 9-28)

A plurality of receivers including at least one mobile receiver, each of the plurality of receivers including a current address and a location (e.g. compare with user's current location; Col.14; 1-11, 62-67 and Col.4; 3-14) in a geographic area and reporting the address and the location to the geospatial database on a selected frequency; (302; Fig.2, Col.3; 9-28) and

The transmitter enabling reception of a message and a geographic destination designator designating a geographic destination for the message, (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1)

And further enabling accessing the geospatial database to identify the addresses of the receivers in the geographic destination and targeting the message to the identified receivers at their reported address for each said identified receiver. (Col.4; 28-52 and

Art Unit: 2617

Claim 1)

As per claim 13, Richton teaches:

The telecommunication system according to claim 12, further comprising the transmitter receiving a delivery method designator associated with the message and transmitting the message according to the designated delivery method. (Col.5; 26-43)

As per claim 14, Richton teaches:

The telecommunication system according to claim 12, further comprising the transmitter operating at an OSI pplication layer. (i.e. email...voicemail etc; Col.5; 21-25)

As per claim 16, Richton teaches:

The telecommunication system according to claim 12, further comprising the message including a reply request, and wherein any one of the receivers that does not respond to the reply request may be identified. (Col.3; 39-62 and Col.7; 2-11)

As per claim 18, Richton teaches:

The telecommunication system according to claim 12, further comprising a processor for determining whether an event has occurred and, if the event has occurred, sending the message and geographic destination designator to the transmitter. (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1)

As per claim 19, Richton teaches:

The telecommunication system according to claim 18, wherein the event further comprises a reported location being across a border, the border defining a boundary for the locations of the receivers, the message being a border crossing warning, and the geographic destination designator designating across the border. (Col.3; 39-62 and Col.7; 2-11)

As per claim 21, Richton teaches:

The telecommunication system according to claim 12, further comprising an intelligent agent operating within the network to access the geospatial database to identify the addresses of the receivers in the geographic destination. (Col.4; 3-14)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- VI. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

VII. Claims 6 & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton in view of Weisshaar et al. [US 6580916].

As per claims 6, 15, Richton teaches all the particulars of the claim except the transmitting the message further comprises serially unicasting the message. However, Weisshaar teaches in an analogous art, that the method according to claims 1, 12, respectively wherein the transmitting the message further comprises serially unicasting the message. (Col.10; 66-Col.11; 9) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Richton including the transmitting the message further comprises serially unicasting the message in order to provide a methods and apparatus for providing services to wireless equipment in a wireless communications system.

VIII. Claims 8 & 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton in view of Ogasawara et al. [US 6947754].

As per claims 8, 17, Richton teaches all the particulars of the claim except the address of at least one of the recipients being a wide area network address and changing the wide area network address of the recipient to dynamically obtaining a new wide area network address due to movement of the recipient. However, Ogasawara teaches in an

analogous art, that the method according to claims 1, 12, respectively further comprising the address of at least one of the recipients being a wide area network address and changing the wide area network address of the recipient to dynamically obtaining a new wide area network address due to movement of the recipient. (Col.8; 64-Col.9; 23)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Richton including the address of at least one of the recipients being a wide area network address and changing the wide area network address of the recipient to dynamically obtaining a new wide area network address due to movement of the recipient in order to provide a method for registering a location of a mobile communications terminal served by a mobile communications network. The method comprises: broadcasting, from each of one or multiple specific base stations a radio-zone information notification signal indicating each of the base station's own radio zone.

IX. Claims 11 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton in view of Richard [US 6785551].

As per claims 11, 20, Richton teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the message further comprises commercial information. However, Richard teaches in an analogous art, that the method according to claims 1, 12, respectively wherein the message further comprises commercial information. (Abstract, Col.2; 23-35) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Richton including wherein the message further comprises commercial information in order to providing services to individuals in a mobile

environment. More particularly, it relates to an efficient process for dynamically providing geographically relevant information to individuals in a mobile environment.

X. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton in view of Ogasawara as applied to claims above and further in view of Weisshaar.

As per claim 22, Richton teaches:

A telecommunication system comprising:

A network; a transmitter connected to the network; (Abstract, Col.2; 59-Col.3; 8)

A memory containing a geospatial database and in communication with the transmitter; (201; Fig.2, Col.3; 9-28)

A plurality of receivers including at least one mobile receiver, each of the plurality of receivers including an address and a location and reporting the current address (e.g. compare with user's current location; Col.14; 1-11, 62-67 and Col.4; 3-14) and the location to the geospatial database; (302; Fig.2, Col.3; 9-28) and,

The transmitter operating at an OSI application level to receive a message and a geographic destination designator designating a geographic destination for the message, to access the geospatial database to identify the addresses of the receivers in the geographic destination, to target the message to the identified receivers at their reported address, (Col.4; 28-52 and Claim 1) and

Richton doesnot teach expressly, each of the plurality of receivers including an address and a location and reporting the address and the location to the geospatial database, at least one of the addresses being a wide area network address which changes.

However, Ogasawara teaches in an analogous art, that each of the plurality of receivers including an address and a location and reporting the address and the location to the geospatial database, at least one of the addresses being a wide area network address which changes; (Col.8; 64-Col.9; 23) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Richton each of the plurality of receivers including an address and a location and reporting the address and the location to the geospatial database, at least one of the addresses being a wide area network address which changes in order to provide a method for registering a location of a mobile communications terminal served by a mobile communications network. The method comprises: broadcasting, from each of one or multiple specific base stations a radio-zone information notification signal indicating each of the base station's own radio zone. and

Richton doesnot teach expressly, to transmit the message as a series of unicast messages to the identified receivers. However, Weisshaar teaches in an analogous art, to transmit the message as a series of unicast messages to the identified receivers. (Col.10; 66-Col.11; 9) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Richton including to transmit the message as a series of unicast messages to the identified receivers in order to provide a methods and apparatus for providing services to wireless equipment in a wireless communications system.

Art Unit: 2617

Response to Amendments & Arguments

XI. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/13/2006 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Concerning Claim 1:

In rejoinder to Applicant's argument that Richton doesn't teach, "the current

location of the receiver;" it is noted that Richton supports the assertion as, to compare the

geographic database with user's current location and therefore find the user's exact

location geographically. (Please perceive Col.14; 1-11, 62-67 and Col.4; 3-14) Hence, it

is believed that Richton still teaches the claimed limitations.

The above arguments also recites for the claims 12, 22, consequently the response

is the same explanation as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the

refutation are sustained.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones,

958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Page 13

In this case, Ogasawara teaches a technique for location registration of a mobile terminal, which can be easily read on the claimed invention to find a location of a mobile termibal (Please perceive Abstract, Col.8; 64-Col.9; 23) by assigning the above discussed factors, which is in the same field of endeavor as Richton. Therefore, one skill in the art would recognize the combination of the above two references is proper.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

Conclusion

XII. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or EBC@uspto.gov.

Sharad Rampuria Patent Examiner Art Unit 2617

GEORGE EXAMINER